





APPLICATION NO.	. Fi	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/489,514	09/489,514 01/21/2000		S. R. Narayanan	06618-406001	5937	
20985	7590	10/01/2002				
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC 4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE SUITE 500				EXAM	EXAMINER	
				MERCADO,	MERCADO, JULIAN A	
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				1745	13	
			DATE MAILED: 10/01/2002	DATE MAILED: 10/01/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

÷/		
		AS-13
	Applicant(s)	
	NARAYANAN ET A	L
	Art Unit	
do	1745	
sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
ent of this applic amendment whi	NDITION FOR ALL cation. A proper relich places the application filed Request for the control of	ply to a cation in
ner a) or b)]		
on.		
m the mailing date o	e final rejection, whicheven f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION.	
onding amount of the reply originally set in	136(a) and the appropriate fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or ection, even if timely filed,	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
filed within the pavoid dismissal	period set forth in of the appeal.	
and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
or appeal by mat	terially reducing or	simplifying the
ding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
	,,,	
n has been con	sidered but does No	OT place the
irected SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
	o)⊠ will be entered low or appended.	and an
d or b)∏ disan	proved by the Exar	miner.
9) Paper No(s).		
-,, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -,	 -	[

Advisory Action

		10/
Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/489,514	NARAYANAN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Julian A. Mercado	1745	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover

THE REPLY FILED 09 September 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed a condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal for Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]
a) The period for reply expires three months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE:
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: 7-20.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)
10. Other:

Application/Control Number: 09/489,514

Art Unit: 1745

ADVISORY ACTION

This Advisory Action is responsive to Applicant's response filed September 9, 2002.

Applicant's response will be entered upon timely filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief. Applicant's arguments therein have been fully considered, however they are not persuasive.

Applicant submits that the Zonyl reference describes a different function for the fluoropolymer particles as compared with the Serpico reference. This is not persuasive, however, in view of both references employing fluoropolymer particles as a coating additive within an aqueous dispersion. Additionally, it is asserted that the Zonyl reference was relied upon as a basis for obviousness in employing a smaller particle size for the fluoropolymer particles already disclosed within Serpico's invention for reasons such as increased dispersion stability and decreased surface tension.

Arguments against the Zonyl particles in Applicant's invention not performing the role of a binder (unlike in Serpico wherein the fluoropolymer particles are alleged to melt-flow and coat the catalyst particles) are not persuasive, as limitations precluding such melt-flow and coating of the catalyst particles are outside the scope of the present claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julian A. Mercado whose telephone number is (703) 305-0511. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.



Art Unit: 1745

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick J. Ryan, can be reached on (703) 308-2383. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3599 for regular communications and (703) 305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

September 27, 2002

Patrick Byen
Supervison: Pater Framine:
Technology